



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

debates, also, which took place in the Congregations, held prior to the decree, we find the Bishop of Cava attributing justification wholly to faith. Cardinal Pole and the Archbishop of Siena held the same views; and both left the Council. It is remarkable that some of those who were strongest in supporting the Papal supremacy approximated to the Protestant view of Justification. Thus, Albert Pighius, who put forward, in his work on the hierarchy, the most ultramontane views respecting the Papacy, is accused, by Bellarmine, of unsoundness on the question of Justification; and the Bishop of Bitonto, whose sermon at Trent was full of the grossest flatteries of the Pope, delivered a statement harmonizing with the views of the reformers about Justification. To reconcile, or, at least, to gloss over, such discordant opinions, a decree was drawn up, containing very obscure and inconsistent statements; and which, consequently, gave occasion to violent disputes in the Romish Church itself. No sooner was the session ended, than Dominic a Soto, who took a leading part in the debates, published a book, which was answered by Andreas Vega, his chief opponent; and each of them claimed the authority of the Council for his opinion. Not long after the close of the Council, the diversity of opinion in the Romish Church on the subject of Justification became still more apparent. Michael Rains, Chancellor of the University of Louvain (the foremost in the condemnation of Luther), and one of the theologians sent by Philip II. to Trent, published certain opinions, which were denounced as unsound, on the very subjects treated in the sixth session. Some of these opinions were condemned by Pope Pius V. in a bull, dated 1567; some he did not venture specifically to condemn, because he knew they were held by the whole Dominican order, who were now engaged with the Jesuits in a violent dispute on these very topics. The Dominicans held opinions, which, as Cardinal du Perron said, a Protestant might subscribe to. The Jesuits had changed their doctrine. On their first institution, they were devoted followers of Aquinas; but they gradually gave up their adhesion to this great teacher, and finally adopted views utterly opposed to his, partly through jealousy of the Dominicans, and partly through opposition to the Protestants. Francis Borgia, the third general of the Jesuit order, and a saint of the Roman Church, held opinions which several Protestants, who were burnt at Valladolid, declared to be identical with their own. In 1588 appeared the work of the Jesuit Molina, on the concord of free will with the gifts of grace. He maintained that free will, even without the help of grace, can produce morally good works; that it can resist temptation; and can elevate itself to various acts of hope, faith, love, and repentance. The publication of this worked to an open rupture between the Jesuits and Dominicans. Pope Clement VIII. committed the investigation of the question to a congregation of divines; and he would probably have pronounced his decision in favour of the Dominicans, only for his death, which took place in 1605. His successor, Paul V., decreed that each party should retain liberty of opinion until a formal decision should be pronounced. The congregation had held more than one hundred sessions, during a period of more than eight years, and this was the result. Truly, the Council of Trent had succeeded in wrapping up their meaning in words of impenetrable obscurity. In 1640, the controversy, which was left undecided by the above-named Popes, was revived by the publication of Cornelius Jansen's famous work, *Augustinus*. He had been chancellor of Louvain (like Baius before him), and Bishop of Ypres, and had devoted twenty years of study to the great Latin Father. He declared that he was delivering a new doctrine, but that which had been the immemorial teaching of the Church. We cannot now enter upon a detail of the Jansenist controversy, in which the Jesuits at last triumphed; suffice it to say, that at the end of all the legal injustice by which these opinions were attempted to be stifled, there was still no unity of doctrine in the Church of Rome. During the very period when the persecution was at its height there was an utter want of agreement upon the disputed doctrine among the leading Churchmen. The Jansenist tenets, long after their intended extinction, spread over Spain, Germany, and Italy, and were proclaimed even in the pulpits of Rome. Holland is at present the head quarters of Jansenism. The Jansenist Church at Utrecht, though anathematized by many Popes, has continued to receive communications, letters, and the fullest acknowledgment from Romish Bishops, and other ecclesiastics. The existence of such a party within the pale of the Romish Church is a standing proof of want of unity of doctrine in that communion; and furnishes an unanswerable *arg. ad hominem* when Roman Catholics taunt us with our sectarian divisions. Thus, then, (to return to the point whence we set out), the Church of Rome is committed by the Council of Trent to a doctrine respecting Justification at variance with Scripture, and with the teaching of the best and wisest men of all ages, since the days of Augustine. And within the pale of that Church there has existed, ever since the decree of Trent, a wide diversity of opinion on the very point which that decree professed to fix infallibly and immutably.

* "Ex adverso minus recte disserunt Cavenda, qui profusa oratione omnia ipsi sibi arrogabat." Pallav. Lib. viii., chap. 4., s. 11.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

OUR readers have heard something lately of saints, and may like to hear more.

We reverence and honour the saints of God. Polycarp, Augustine, and Cyprian were men "subject to like passions as we are;" so was Elijah (James v. 17), whom God took up into heaven in a chariot of fire (2 Kings ii. 11, 4 Kings, Douay), so were Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; and Moses too; and all the noble list of witnesses, "of whom the world was not worthy." (Heb. ch. xi.) Like St. Paul, the saints had their treasure in earthen vessels. (2 Cor. iv. 7.) And the grace of God is the more magnified in their weakness. In every age God has had chosen vessels, whom he has made lights in the world; and we reverence and honour his saints for that which he has wrought in them. But the more we reverence the saints of God, the more we must protest against the manufacture of false saints. We have shown how saints are made out of other persons' bones. (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Nov. '55, Cornelius; August, '54, p. 92, Theodosia.) And we object to men being put into the list for very questionable or very wicked actions. Thomas A'Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was murdered in the year 1170, or, as it is the fashion with some to call him, "St. Thomas of Canterbury," appears to us to be a saint of very questionable character. We shall take our account of his doings from the letters of Pope Alexander III., of Thomas A'Becket himself, and Gilbert, who was then Bishop of London, and from the accounts given by the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work "Concilia Generalia." From them we quote the letters also, except those of Bishop Gilbert and the English clergy, which we quote from Stillingfleet, who quotes the MS. in the Cotton library, Oxford.

Labbe and Cossart relate as follows, from Matthew Paris, an old English historian:—"In the year of our Lord, 1164, January 25, in presence of King Henry II., at Clarendon, the president being John of Oxford, by command of the king himself, there being present also the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, counts, barons, and chief men of the kingdom, there was made a recognition, or record, of some part of the customs and liberties of his ancestors—viz., of King Henry, his grandfather, and of other things which ought to be observed in the kingdom and held by all, on account of dissensions and discords often arising between the clergy and judges of our lord the king and other princes of the kingdom."

Then follow the customs of England, in sixteen heads, of which we can only mention here that about which the chief debate arose—viz., III.—that clergymen accused should answer in the king's court for such crimes as ought to be answered for in that court, and in the Church court for such things as should be answered for in that court; and that if a clergyman was convicted of a crime, or had confessed it, the Church ought not to protect him any further from justice.

The question arose thus: Philip de Broc, a canon of Bedford, had committed murder. He was to be tried by the Chief Justice, according to English law; but his bishop, and Archbishop Becket, would not give up the murderer. They denied the king's right to punish a clergyman for murder, and said that the murderer, being a clergyman, had only to perform the penance directed by them. It was against this attempt of theirs that King Henry introduced that third article.

We now return to the history of what was done at the Assembly of Clarendon.

"This recognition, or record, concerning the wicked customs and liberties, and dignities hateful to God, the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, clergy, with the counts and barons, and all the chief men, swore to, and firmly promised with their voices, on the word of truth, that they would hold and observe them to their lord the king, in good faith, and without any prevarication, for ever."

A further account, which Labbe and Cossart, the Jesuits, profess to take from "the Acts of Thomas of Canterbury," in the Pope's own library at the Vatican, expressly states that Archbishop Becket was the first man who swore to keep and observe these customs.⁴ The Jesuits give, however, the account of St. Thomas A'Becket's repentance.

"Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, however, came to himself when he had yielded to unjust laws, and most detestable to all the faithful people of Christ, and had bound himself by an oath to observe them. Diligently examining the thing which he had rashly perpetrated, he

severely afflicted himself with austere food, and humbled his body in clothing, suspending himself from the service of the altar, until by confession and worthy fruits of penitence he had merited to be absolved by the Supreme Pontiff."

"The Acts" in the Pope's library accordingly compare his conduct to the fall and repentance of David and St. Peter—though it does seem to us that the resolution to screen murderers from punishment, after he had sworn to let them be punished, does hardly deserve the name of repentance. Unfortunately, however, for the saint's character, we have another account of the transaction which it is not possible to disbelieve, because it is contained in a letter written to Archbishop Becket himself, by Gilbert, Bishop of London, who was present at the whole transaction. Bishop Gilbert's account is as follows:—"Three days all the bishops withstood the king's desire, and no threats could move them; but they resolved rather than yield, to die on the spot for Christ and his Church. At last Becket withdrew from them, and coming in again used these words to them:—'It is the king's pleasure that I should forswear myself at present, and I will do it, and repent afterwards.' At the hearing of them they were all astonished, and their hearts failed them, and so they all promised, on the word of truth, to observe the ancient customs."

It would be something new to us to find that God's saints of old, who gave their bodies to death for the truth of the Gospel, ever thought it lawful to deceive even heathen kings with false oaths, intending to break their oaths, and then to repent at leisure. But Becket's conduct was worthy of the object which he wanted to gain.

Labbe and Cossart give the Pope's letter on this transaction. The Pope says he has heard that Becket refrained from saying mass, "on account of some excess or other." The Pope thinks it would give rise to scandal, and disapproves of it. The Pope gives some advice which we think no conscientious Christian can approve: "Your diligence ought prudently to consider that it makes a great difference when things are done of deliberation and one's own will, and when they are committed from ignorance or from necessity. . . . Your intention gives the name to your work. For, as it is somewhere read, sin is so far voluntary, that unless it is voluntary it is not sin; and the Lord Almighty does not consider the act of the agent, but considers rather the intention, and distinguishes the will." So the Pope tells him to confess, and sends him absolution *beforehand* for what he has done.

We think the above most dangerous advice to give to any sinner; and most unfit for one who had wilfully committed perjury, intending to repent afterwards.

In another epistle, the Pope thus directs him: "By no means observe what you have promised, but rather be careful to recall it, and study to be reconciled to God and the Church, for the unlawful promise."

That the Pope was not much shocked at the false oath appears from the fact, that in several epistles afterwards, he advises Becket to deceive the King still further. One instance will suffice: "And if in these things all matters do not succeed to your wishes, at present *dissemble*, intending in process of time to bring back all things which ought to be corrected to their former state, with the help of the Lord."

Strange advice from "the head of Christ's Church on earth" to one who had already "dissembled," even to perjury itself. "Like master, like man." We could hardly expect the Archbishop to be more scrupulous than the Pope, or the Saint a greater lover of truth than he that gave him absolution for perjury.

"St. Thomas" was an apt pupil. He learnt to rant as bravely as any Pope of them all. When he had fled the kingdom, he wrote to the English bishops as follows:—

"My most beloved brothers, why do you not rise up for me against the wicked? . . . We have borne with this lord, the King of England, enough, and too much. . . . It seems to me a dangerous and intolerable thing, you should hitherto leave unpunished so great excesses of him and his officials, about the Church of God, and ecclesiastical persons. . . . That writing in which are contained those—not customs, but rather deformities—by which the Church of England is disturbed and confounded, and the authority of that writing, *we*, having invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, have publicly condemned and quashed! And we excommunicate all the observers, enforcers, counsellors, aiders, and defenders of them; and by God's authority and our own, we absolve

⁴ Labbe and Com., Con. Gen., vol. x., 1425. Ed. Paris, 1671. We will give the Latin wherever it is of importance.

⁵ Clerici acceperat de quacunque re, summamque a iudicio regis venient in curiam ipsius responderi ibidem de hoc, unde videbatur curie regis, quod ibi sit respondendum, et in curia ecclesiastica unde videbatur quod ibi sit respondendum; ita quod regis iustitiam mittet in curiam sancte ecclesie, ad videndum quomodo res ibi tractabitur. Et si clericus convictus vel confessus fuerit, non debet eum de cetero ecclesia tueri.—Con. Gen. x., 1425.

⁶ Hanc recognitionem sive recordationem de consuetudinibus et libertatibus iniquis, et dignitatibus Deo detestabilibus, archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates, priores, clerici, cum comitibus et Baronibus ac proceribus cunctis, iuraverunt, et firmiter in verbo veritatis promiserunt, viva voce tenendas et observandas domino regi et heredibus suis, bona fide et abque malo ingenio in perpetuum.—Con. Gen. x., 1427.

⁷ Primum igitur ante omnes archiepiscopus in pretaxata forma se obligat, quod videlicet regis consuetudines foret observaturas bona fide.—Con. Gen. x., 1428.

⁸ Con. Gen. x., 1427.

⁹ Labbe and Cossart do not give this letter. We quote it from Stillingfleet's works, vol. v. p. 717, who gives the reference. Giff. Lond. Epist. Tho. Cantuar., l. i., ep. 126, in Cod. Cotton MS.

¹⁰ Occasione cuiusdam excessus. . . . Debet autem diligentia tua prudenter advertere, quod plurimum interest, quando ex deliberatione et propria voluntate, et quando ex ignorantia vel necessitate aliqua committuntur. . . . Intentio tua operi tuo nomen imponit. Nam, sicut et alibi legitur, neque adeo voluntarium est peccatum, ut nisi fuerit voluntarium, non sit peccatum. Et omnipotens Dominus non factum agentis attendit, sed considerat potius intentionem, et iudicet voluntatem.—Con. Gen. x., 1430.

¹¹ . . . Quod promissis nullatenus observetis, sed hoc potius revocare curetis; et de promissione illicita Deo studentis et ecclesie reconciliari.—Con. Gen. x., 1194.

¹² Et si tibi in his non omnia secundum beneplacitum tuum succedant; quod invens distimules, quae corrigenda fuerint, ad statum pristinum, processu temporis, auctore Domino, reducturus.—Con. Gen. x., 1203.

all you bishops from the promise by which you are bound, against the constitution of the Church, to observe them.")

Is it not a brave thing to hear an archbishop QUASH the laws of England, which he himself had sworn, "in good faith, and on the word of truth," to observe and keep! But there are archbishops in Ireland now who would be only too happy to quash the laws of England if they dared.

Archbishop Becket stated in that letter what laws he quashed. One of them was—"That clergymen should be tried in the Secular Courts" for murder and other such crimes. But Becket thought (and perhaps he thought sincerely, for the mind of man is subject to great delusions, under a false system) that in protecting a murderer from punishment he was fighting for a great Christian principle. Hear his own account, in a letter to the Pope: "That is snatched from Jesus Christ, which HE PURCHASED WITH HIS OWN BLOOD: the secular power extends its hand into his own inheritance (the clergy), nor do the canons now prevail even to protect the clergy (when guilty of murder), who were exempt by special privilege from this jurisdiction."

That exemption and privilege, founded on the forged decretal epistles, the Popes long and earnestly laboured to establish in Europe. The English clergy themselves, in the time of Becket, recorded their opinion of its working, in a letter which they addressed to the Pope. "The peace of the kingdom was very much disturbed by the insolence and crimes of some of the clergy; the king, for the safety of his people, pressed the bishops, after their censures, to give such guilty persons up to the laws, because bare degrading, which was all the Church's censures reached to, was by no means sufficient punishment for wilful murder. This liberty was extended even to a licitor, or acolythus."

The history of the actors in this contest is full of melancholy interest. King Henry was provoked by the outrageous conduct of Becket to exclaim, "Will no one rid me of this man?" Four of his servants who heard it went and murdered Becket in his church.

Far be it from us to palliate the crimson guilt of murder. Yet it is a striking instance of retribution, that he who laboured to establish impunity for murder in his own order, died himself by the hand of murderers.

Murder does not turn a perjured man into a saint: yet the Pope canonized "St. Thomas of Canterbury;" and he is still worshipped as a saint and celebrated as a "glorious pontifex" in the Breviary for the 29th of December.

Hence, our readers may see why it is that we who honour and reverence the saints of God are so jealous of the Pope's saints; for Becket was a saint after the Pope's own heart.

But, there is a God, and murder never prospers. Would to God that all Irishmen would learn this lesson. The horror at the deed was so great, that King Henry II., brave and resolute as he was, was forced to submit the ancient laws of his kingdom to the pleasure of the bishops of Rome.

But King Henry II. was cunning, too, when he was beaten, and he had his opportunity; for there were two POPES at that time. So King Henry swore that he and all his kingdom should follow the false Pope.

So the true Pope took fright in his turn; and with a baseness rarely equalled by Popes, he offered to sell Ireland to King Henry II., if he would be a good boy in future; and King Henry II. said, "done" to the bargain. That Pope was Alexander III., whom we had occasion to mention in our article on "the Blessed Cornelius" in our number for November, 1855.

This is the secret history of the sale of Irish nationality. So all Irishmen, of every creed and party, have an interest in the story we have been telling. If Pope Alexander's plans had fully succeeded, the sexton of every Roman chapel in Ireland now might murder whom he pleased, and answer for it to the bishops only, without any fear of being tried for his life in the Queen's Court.

Let us thank God that we live under laws which render it impossible that such horrid claims for liberty in the ministers of Christ to murder with impunity can be now urged by Rome. But, let us remember that it was the laws of a free country which at last put down such horrid claims; and let us remember, too, that it must ever be the interest of every free man to maintain the laws of a free country.

THE JESUITS.

It is, we believe, well known to our readers, that the Jesuit body were organized originally in the middle of the sixteenth century, for the purpose of resisting the progress of the Reformation throughout Europe; and, undoubtedly, to their efforts the Church of Rome was mainly indebted for the successful resistance she offered to the spread of the reformed doctrines in southern Europe.

Viewed with suspicion by the laity, but patronized by successive popes, the Jesuits soon became identified with the cause of Romanism, and in their ranks the intellectual vigour of the advocates of the Church of Rome was almost exclusively developed. Hated and feared by their enemies, their very name has become a bye-word to describe deceit and falsehood, and to them has been imputed, by both Protestants and Roman Catholics, the incultation and adoption in practice of that monstrous doctrine—that the end sanctifies the means.

We do not, however, wish here to give currency to all those imputations which Protestant writers have brought against them, but have preferred to try them by the testimony of that Church to which they belonged, and to whose cause they devoted their abilities and energies; and we, therefore, propose to lay before our readers some extracts from the Bull of Pope Clement XIV., by which the order was suppressed. That Bull issued from the Papal See in the year 1773, and is, in every respect, a most remarkable document. It commences by stating the cause of the institution of the society, and after enumerating the privileges conferred on it by successive popes, thus proceeds—"Notwithstanding so many and so great favours, it appears, from the apostolical constitutions, that almost at the very moment of its institution there arose, in the bosom of this society, diverse seeds of discord and dissension, not only amongst the companions themselves, but with other regular orders—the secular clergy, the academies, the universities, the public schools, and, lastly, even with the princes of the states in which the society was received."

"These discussions and disputes arose sometimes concerning the nature of their vows—the time of admission to them—the power of expulsion—the right of admission to holy orders without a sufficient title, and without having taken the solemn vows;—sometimes concerning the absolute authority assumed by the general of the said order, and on matters relating to the good government and discipline of the order. In short, accusations of the gravest nature, and very detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the Christian republic, have been continually received against the said order. Hence the origin of that infinity of appeals and protests against this society which so many sovereigns have laid at the foot of the throne of our predecessors."

The Bull then mentions that Philip II. of Spain (probably the most bigoted ruler that the world ever saw) appealed to Sixtus V. against the society, and that Sixtus, convinced that his objections were just and well founded, did, without hesitation, comply therewith, and in consequence named a distinguished bishop to visit and examine the matter; but that Gregory XIV., the successor of Sixtus, not only refused to hear the accusations against the order, but even ordered, under pain of excommunication, that no person should presume to attack the order. The Bull further proceeds to say—"Who would have thought that even these dispositions should prove ineffectual towards appeasing the cries and appeals against the society, which many represented as contrary to the orthodox faith and to sound morals. The dissensions among themselves, and with others, grew every day more animated; the accusations against the society were multiplied without number, and especially against that insatiable avidity of temporal possessions with which it was reproached. Hence the rise, not only of those well-known troubles which brought so much care and solicitude upon the Holy See, but, also, of the resolutions which certain sovereigns took against the order." The Bull then states an order of the society itself, in 1606, prohibiting its members from interfering in temporal matters, and again proceeds—"We have seen, in the grief of our hearts, that neither these remedies, nor an infinity of others since employed, have produced their due effect, or silenced the accusations and complaints against the said society. Our other predecessors (naming eleven different popes) employed, without effect, all their efforts to the same purpose. In vain did they endeavour, by salutary constitutions, to restore peace to the Church, as well with respect to secular affairs—with which the company ought not to have interfered—as with regard to the missions, which gave rise to great disputes and oppositions on the part of the company; as, likewise, concerning the meaning and practice of certain idolatrous ceremonies adopted in certain places, in contempt of those justly approved of by the Catholic Church; and further, concerning the use and explanation of certain maxims which the Holy See has, with reason, proscribed as scandalous, and manifestly contrary to good morals; and, lastly, concerning other matters of great importance, and prime necessity, towards preserving the integrity and purity of the doctrines of the Gospel; from which maxims have resulted very great inconveniences, and great detriment, both in our days and in past ages—such as the revolts and intestine troubles in some of the Catholic states, and the persecutions against

the Church in some countries of Asia and Europe. After so many storms, troubles, and divisions, every good man looked forward with impatience to the happy day which was to restore peace and tranquillity. But under the reign of Clement XIII. the times became more difficult and tempestuous; complaints multiplied on every side; in some places dangerous seditions arose, tumults, disorders, dissensions, scandals, which, weakening, or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatreds and enmities. Desolation and danger grew to such an height that the very sovereigns, whose piety and liberality towards the company were so well known as to be looked upon as hereditary in their families—we mean our dearly-beloved sons in Christ, the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Sicily—found themselves reduced to the necessity of expelling and driving from their states, kingdoms, and provinces, these very companions of Jesus; persuaded that there remained no other remedy to so great evils, and that this step was necessary, in order to prevent the Christians from rising one against another, and from massacring each other, in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church. Our said dear sons having since considered that even this remedy would not be sufficient towards reconciling the whole Christian world, unless the said society was absolutely abolished and suppressed, made known their demands and wills in this matter to our said predecessor, Clement XIII. They united their common prayers and authority to obtain that this last method might be put in practice, as the only one capable of assuring the constant repose of their subjects, and the good of the Catholic Church in general."

"Actuated by so many and important considerations, and, as we hope, aided by the presence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit; compelled besides by the necessity of our ministry, which strictly obliges us to conciliate, maintain, and confirm the peace and tranquillity of the Christian republic; having further considered that the said company of Jesus can no longer produce those abundant fruits, and those great advantages, with a view to which it was instituted and approved of by so many of our predecessors, and endowed with so many and great privileges: that, on the contrary, it is very difficult, not to say impossible, that the Church should recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said society subsisted; in consequence hereof, and forced by other motives which prudence and the good government of the Church have dictated, after a mature deliberation, we do, out of our certain knowledge, and the fulness of our apostolical knowledge, suppress and abolish the said company; we deprive it of all activity whatever in its houses, schools, colleges, hospitals, lands, and, in short, every other place whatsoever; we abrogate and annul its statutes, rules, customs, decrees, and constitutions, even though confirmed by oath, and approved by the Holy See, or otherwise."

Such was the tenor of the famous Bull by which the Society of Jesuits was suppressed; and, if we examine it carefully, the main grounds on which the condemnation was rested, and on account of which the infallible judge passed sentence on the society, were these—

First—An insatiable desire for temporal possessions and undue interference in the internal affairs of those states in which they were established;

Secondly—Disturbance of the Church by these intrigues;

Thirdly—The encouragement in their missions of idolatrous practices;

And, fourthly—The use of maxims, with reason proscribed as scandalous, and manifestly contrary to good morals, and from which maxims the Bull alleges the revolts and intestine troubles of some of the Catholic states proceeded.

These are the charges which the Bull alleges were proved against the society, and on account of which the kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples banished the society from their dominions; and, not content with that, demanded the entire suppression and abolition of the order. And yet, in the nineteenth century, Rome again leagues herself with the Society of Jesuits, again evokes their activity, and restores their organization. Have, then, the Jesuits abandoned these principles and maxims, so emphatically condemned by the Bull of Pope Clement XIV.? If they have, what proof has been given to the world of such abandonment? or what record exists of their repentance, and renunciation of them? If they have not abandoned them, then, surely, by their restoration, Rome proclaims to the world her sanction of that insatiable avidity of temporal possessions, and of that undue interference in the internal affairs of other states, which distinguished the Jesuits, and declares her approbation of those maxims which encouraged revolts and intestine troubles even in Roman Catholic states. In future numbers we shall refer to the historical facts which abundantly justified the condemnation contained in the Bull.

WHAT IS NOT IN THE DOUAY TESTAMENT.

We had pleasure last month in giving publicity to the statement made by Mr. O'Hagan at the trial of Father Petcherine, that during the last seven years 400,000 copies of the Douay translation of the Scriptures had been circulated. We should be glad to think that one of these copies had found its way to each of our Roman Catholic readers. Nothing would please us more

3 Fratres mei dilectissimi, quare non consurgitis mihi adversus malignantes? . . . Dominum regem Angliæ satis superque sustinimus. . . Periculosum est intolerabile de cetero nobis visum est, tantis illius officialiumque suorum circa ecclesiam Dei et ecclesiasticas personas excessibus ut bacterium impunitis relinquere. . . Scriptum illud, in quo illæ non consuetudines, sed privitates potius, quibus perturbatur et confunditur Anglicana ecclesia, continetur, ipsiusque Scripti auctoritatem, invocata Spiritus sancti gratia, publice condemnamus, et eas arduis: universos etiam observatores, exactores, adiutores, ac defensores earum excommunicamus: omnesque vos episcopos a promissione, qua contra constitutionem ecclesiasticam ad earum observationem tenebamini, auctoritate Dei et nostra absolvimus. — Con. Gen. x., 120.

4 Eripitur Jesu Christo quod sanguine suo comparavit, in ipsam ejus sortem potestas secularis manum extendit. . . nec statuta canonum. . . Clerici quidem parociani valeant modo, qui ab hac jurisdictione, speciali privilegio fuerunt exempti. — Con. Gen. x., 119.

5 S. Illingdell, vol. v, 712.

6 Con. Gen. x., 126.